

# The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 4, 1860.

NO. 38.

## The Principia

Published Weekly, at 389 Pearl Street, (two doors above  
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODRILL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDER, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to  
MELANCTHON E. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,  
as above.

### PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law—our expediency; obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promises; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

### THE PROPERTY TENURE OF SLAVERY.

The following article arrested our attention on its first appearance, almost four months ago, and from that time to this, we have been trying to find time and room to publish it in our columns, accompanied with suitable comments. But the present time seems still more loudly to call for it, than any previous one. Every controversy concerning slavery, slaveholding, and the claims of slaveholders, whether in the political or the ecclesiastical world—the Government of the Territories—the discipline of the Church—the propriety of the "British Aid Mission" of the Church of the Puritans—the conflicting claims of rival Presidential candidates—all, ALL are found to hinge on the question, whether slaves are to be regarded as *property*, whether they are indeed thus regarded by slaveholders; whether there be any such thing as holding men in *slavery* without holding them as *property*; whether the nation can tolerate slavery anywhere in the nation, without sanctioning the claim of *property in man*: whether the church and ministry can fail to rebuke *slaveholding* without failing to rebuke the sin of holding the image of God, the price of a Savior's blood, as *property*? We hail it as a token for good, that this claim of *property in man*, is coming to be studied, and that the "question" respecting it, is coming to be regarded by intelligent journalists as being the "question really at issue."

From the N. Y. Times of April 9th.

#### Slaves as Property—the Question Really at Issue.

Mr. Wigfall, the new Senator from Texas, in one of his recent speeches in the Senate, said he denied that "we at the South draw any distinction between slaves and any other property. We ask simply," said he, "that that *property* shall be put upon the same footing as any other species of *property*. We ask that and we ask nothing more."

Mr. Wigfall seemed to be under the impression that he was speaking in the spirit of moderation and forbearance. This "simple" demand of the South, evidently struck him as the merest trifle in the world; and no language can picture his disgust and horror at finding that the people of the North, were unwilling to make this slight concession. But neither Mr. Wigfall nor those pro-slavery ultraists who are fond of dwelling upon the same point, are quite as simple as they would be thought. They know very well that if they can establish this point, in the law and public sentiment of the country, they will have everything they could possibly desire. In fact, there will be left nothing more to be conceded. All the planks in all the platforms of both parties—all the contests about Territorial sovereignty, the extension of slavery, the limits of Federal power, &c., become utterly empty and useless. If slaves are *property*, in the same sense and to the same extent as "lands, horses, mules and hogs," as Mr. Wigfall, in another part of his speech, declared that they are—if they are to be thus regarded and treated by the Legislatures, Courts, and people of the Union—if this is the status upon which they are placed, and upon which they are to be maintained by the Constitution of the United States, any further controversy on the sub-

ject, is either the idlest of shams, or the most flagrant injustice. In that case, Mr. Wigfall need resort to no elaborate argument, to prove that neither Congress nor the Territorial Legislatures can exclude slavery from Federal Territory. It cannot be excluded anywhere, by any power or from any jurisdiction—State or Territorial. What would Mr. Wigfall say to a law of South Carolina—or a clause in the Constitution of that State—which should declare all title to property in land, in horses, in hogs and mules utterly invalid and void? No state, no society, has any right thus to confiscate property—thus to destroy that which rests upon an older and more solid basis than any form of government—without which, indeed, there can be no such thing as government, anywhere.

It is easy to see that the pro-slavery party have selected this principle as the Malakoff of their peculiar institution. That the Federal Constitution recognizes slaves as *property* appears to be a plausible and comparatively innocent proposition. It has been repeated so often—its truth has been so generally assumed, and even Northern men have so frequently conceded it as a matter of fact, that Southern politicians, not without reason, count upon establishing it as a point of Constitutional law. When they have done this, they have done everything. They have access both to Territories and to States. They have established the right to carry slaves into Federal Territory, and to hold them in spite of Congress, in spite of Territorial Legislatures, and in spite of Constitutions. They have virtually annulled the laws and the action of all States which have abolished slavery, and will have made their institution and its code just as universal, just as permanent, just as completely out of the reach of hostile legislation, as that general law of property which lies at the basis of all government, and, indeed, of all society. Mr. Wigfall says, "we ask that, and we ask nothing more!" What a pattern of forbearance—what a model of moderation Mr. Wigfall is!

The Constitution of the United States does not recognize slaves as *property*, at all. There is not a solitary section, phrase, or syllable in it, which countenances the assumption that slaves are *property* precisely as lands, horses, mules and hogs are *property*—to use the words of Mr. Wigfall. It does undoubtedly recognize slavery; but it does even that only silently and by implication. But it gives not the slightest color or countenance to the doctrine that slaves are *only property*—that they are to be solely governed by the laws which govern property—and that they have none of the rights which belong to persons. On the contrary, with studied and deliberate purpose, in each and every allusion which it makes to slaves, the Constitution speaks of them as *persons*—which they cannot possibly be, if they are solely and exclusively *property*. If they are persons, they are entitled to personal rights: they are subjects of moral law:—they have certain spiritual powers and faculties of which no laws can divest them, and which no human power can ignore or disregard without committing a moral wrong. *Property* has no such rights,—no such faculties. The owner of a hog may fatten, kill and eat him if he pleases:—the owner of a slave cannot. A slave may be held accountable for his acts,—may be punished for theft,—may be guilty of murder:—a horse cannot. It is perfectly absurd to speak of the two as being alike *property*,—as holding to the law and the State, precisely the same relation, in the same sense and to the same extent. The very terms—*persons* and *property*—exclude the idea that they can be identical. A person cannot be *property*,—nor can that which is *property* possibly be clothed with the attributes and rights which are inseparable from personality. There may be *property* in certain faculties of a person,—*property* in his labor, *property* in the products of his genius,—*property* in his time, his services and his earnings:—but personality itself cannot be owned.

This is the view of slavery which is apparent in the Constitution of the United States. No man has ever designated but three clauses in that instrument which refer to slavery, directly or indirectly: and in each of these, slaves are spoken of distinctly and deliberately as *persons*. The clause which permits their importation until 1808, simply forbids the prohibition of "the migration or importation of such *persons* as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit." The clause which fixes their ratio of representation, merely declares that, to the whole number of free persons, shall be added "three-fifths of all other *persons*:" and the clause which provides for the return of fugitive slaves, declares, with equal precision, not that "fugitive *property* may be seized and reclaimed, but that "no person held to service and labor in one State" shall be discharged therefrom by the laws of any State into which he may escape.

In each and every one of these clauses, special care is taken to designate slaves as *persons*, and thus necessarily to exclude the idea that they are *property*. Their service, their labor is due to—is owned by—others; but they do not, therefore—because they cannot—surrender any of the rights which always, from the necessity of the case, belong inalienably to *persons* everywhere.

In this sense, the great mass of the Northern people, concede the legal existence, and the Constitutional immunity of slavery. They regard slaves as *persons* owing service and labor to their masters, by virtue of local laws or usages, which are recognized as valid by the Constitution of the United States. But they do not regard them, nor does the Federal Constitution regard them, as being thereby divested of the rights of persons—as being merely *property*, like Wigfall's "horses, lands, mules and hogs." They are still persons—men and women, having rights and owing duties—with moral responsibilities and immunities, of which no law can deprive them, without being itself an outrage upon the law of universal humanity.

The North does not regard slaves as merely *property*, and can never be brought to do so, under any circumstances; for such a concession would be to surrender their own control over slavery within their own limits—to annul their own prohibitions of it, and to establish the law of slavery, like the law of property, as the immovable basis and foundation, not only of the Federal Government, but of every State and every community in the Union. The claim of the South, so far as the South sanctions Mr. Wigfall's view—as it seems inclined to do more and more every day,—is extravagant, and will never be conceded. It really marks the line of division between the two great parties and sections of the Union; and so long as it is persisted in and pressed, it is folly to hope for compromise or peace on this vexed question. It indicates a purpose on the part of the South to abdicate its most important duties toward the slaves,—to abandon all thought of treating them as persons, of respecting their rights, of recognizing any moral obligations towards them,—and to place them in all respects upon the same level with their horses, lands, mules, and hogs. Such an endeavor is unworthy of Southern men, and ought to be at once resented and resisted by them from a feeling of self-respect. Practically, thousands of them—the great mass, indeed, in our judgement—will never act upon such a doctrine; but they should never assent to its theoretical establishment or promulgation. Slaves are *persons*—in the view not only of the Federal Constitution, but of the laws and usages of the Southern States; and Mr. Wigfall's assertion that the South "draws no distinction between them and any other property" is a slander upon the Southern people, which they themselves should be the first to resent.

#### COMMENTS ON THE PRECEDING.

I. We congratulate the Editor of the Times, and we congratulate the country on his discovery of "THE QUESTION REALLY AT ISSUE," in respect to slavery in America. And we ask that "the question may never again be lost sight of, either by that Journal, or any other, or by any one who undertakes to write, print, or speak on the subject.

II. We nevertheless marvel, greatly, that this discovery by *The Times* of "the Question really at issue" should have been so recently made, and after a quarter of a century of labor, on the part of abolitionists, to present it to the nation and the world.

Still more do we marvel that, even now, after having discovered so much, *The Times* did not discover a little more. We marvel that it should have supposed that "Mr. Wigfall, the new Senator from Texas," was putting forth any new demand, or that he was propounding any new theory of slavery, or asserting any new claim of property in slaves, different from the claim that has always been made by the slaveholders, from the beginning? Who has ever heard of a slaveholder's claiming a slave who did not claim that slave as his *property*? By what other tenure was any slave ever held in America?

We can hardly forbear inquiring, in the use of the Editor's own language concerning Mr. Wigfall and his associates, whether he, the Editor of *The Times* "is quite as simple as (he) would be thought?" How could he have lived and moved so many years in American society, without having learned that every human being claimed in America,

as a slave, is claimed as *property*, and on no other demand or tenure of any description? Has he never read in the Slave Code

"A slave is one who is in the power of a master, to whom he belongs?" Civil Code, Art. 35.

"Slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken, reputed and adjudged in law to be *chattels personal*, in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators and assigns, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever." 2 Brevard's Digest. 229. Prince's Digest. 446, &c., &c.

This language is too explicit for evasion, and designedly and effectually cuts off all pretense of their being partly held as *property* and partly as *persons*, which, so far from being possible is not even conceivable or intelligible. No man can affirm it without self-contradiction. *The Times* annot and does not. In the very process of attempting it he affirms its impossibility. "The very terms, *person* and *property*, exclude the idea that they can be identical," or, (it may be added) reconcilable. That the slave is "held accountable for his acts, may be punished for theft, may be guilty of murder," proves only that the slaveholders know that he is a *person*, and consequently that he is *not property*, in reality, any more than they themselves are, however they may treat them.

III. Just so, in regard to what *The Times* says of the Constitution, "The Constitution does not recognize the slaves as property, at all. This is true. Consequently it recognizes no slaves, but recognizes all the inhabitants as free men, 'citizens' as Jefferson persistently affirmed them to be.

But, says the *Times*, "It (the Constitution), 'undoubtedly recognizes Slavery, but it does even that only silently and by implication.'" "Only silently and by implication?" If it does it "by implication" or in any other way, it does it, and the *Times* stands self-stultified! Thus impossible must it forever be, to escape from the conclusions of Mr. Wigfall, without taking the ground of the radical political abolitionists.

IV. But we further congratulate *The Times* and the country on its discovery that the claim of Mr. Wigfall, (which is and must be the claim of all slaveholders while they continue to claim slaves—the claim of the Slave States while they continue to claim the right of being Slave States)—is a claim that amounts to a claim of all that the extreme pro-slavery party "could possibly desire," that, "in fact, there would be left nothing more to be conceded." "When they have done this they have done everything. They have access both to Territories and to States. They have established their right to carry slaves into Federal Territory, and to hold them there in spite of Congress, in spite of Territorial Legislatures, and in spite of constitutions. They have virtually annulled the laws and all the action of all the States which have abolished slavery, and will have made their institution and its code just as universal, just as permanent, just as completely out of the reach of hostile legislation as that general law of property which lies at the basis of all Government and indeed of all society."

In other words, if Mr. Wigfall can only establish the right of slave property as a legal and constitutional right, then the right is established, of carrying and of holding that property in all the Territories and in all the States.

Or, if you put the word "slaveholding" instead of "slave property" in the beginning of the preceding paragraph, and then, near the close of it, substitute the words "their slaves" for "that property" you will have expressed precisely the same thing. For all "slaveholding" in this country, is nothing more nor less than the holding of men as "*property*" and the terms "slaves" and "slave property" are, and ever have been, convertible and synonymous, with every body, throughout the slave States. "The legal relation" of a slaveholder so often alluded to, as being innocent, if there were any such thing, would be the relation of owner of a slave to his slave property, and it could be nothing else.

The discovery of the *Times*, thus explained, so as to be intelligibly understood, becomes identical with the radical doctrine, so long derided and flouted at, namely, that if the nation admits the right of slaveholding, in any part of the United States, it admits the same right in every part of the United States, and there remains no power either in the Territory, the State or the Nation to prevent it, but, only to protect the right of property thus recognized.

There can be no show made of evading this conclusion, but either by the flimsy and self-confuting fiction, already noticed, and of which no man ever formed a clear and intelligible conception, namely that the slave is *partly* held as *property*, while he is *partly* regarded a *person*:—or else by the kindred if not identical fiction that although the slaves are not property in the nature of things, or by the force of natural law, "precisely as lands, horses, mules, and hogs are property"—yet they are property in force of positive enactment, local regulation, or municipal law—a fiction without the shadow of any historical or documentary foundation, on any statute book, written compact, constitution, or the equivalent of them, in this country. as John C. Calhoun, Senators Mason and Douglas, Judges Porter Mathews, &c. &c., have abundantly conceded and testified—a fiction which, if it were upheld by as many statutes, constitutions and compacts, as could be piled up to the height of Chimborazo, could never legalize property in man, any where—upon the well known and time-honored principle that "statutes against fundamental morality are void," and that no compacts can legalize crime.

It is only by this principle that *THE TIMES* or that the NATION can stave off the demand of Mr. Wigfall and the slaveholders. It is even worse than useless for the opponents of slavery supremacy and universality to build up sham fortresses of straw, on the enemies' territory, feigning them to be the enemies' fortresses, and then exhibiting their own skill and bravery in demolishing them, while their enemies are all the while laughing at their folly, and quietly entrenching themselves beyond their reach.—This folly is committed whenever it is represented that "slavery exists at the South, by municipal, local, positive law," and whenever its claims to supremacy and universality are contested on the ground that "slavery, being thus the creature of local municipal law, cannot exist out of the locality or municipality that gave it existence."

There is no such slavery at the South, as is thus described, and all the arguments respecting it are directed against a non-entity, that has no existence but in imagination. The matter-of-fact slavery that does exist, is thus left to fortify and expand itself, at its leisure.

The claim of slavery that exists, and that should be grappled with, is the claim of *absolute property in man*, not on the ground of municipal law, but on the ground of natural right, above and before all human enactments, \* just as Mr. Wigfall describes it, a claim of property in slaves, precisely like "property in lands, horses, mules and hogs."—There is no other claim set up, by any body, and there is no other claim to be opposed, by any one. And he who fights against any other claim, engages only in a sham fight with nobody and with nothing. The same is true of all who fight against slavery or against slavery extension, if by the term "slavery" they mean anything but the assumed right of absolute property in man, on the ground of natural right.

V. Hence, we still further congratulate *The Times* and the country on its conclusion that the claims of slave property, as presented and urged by Mr. Wigfall, cannot be, and must not be acceded to, by the people of the North: "for" as *The Times* justly observes, "such a concession would be to surrender its own control over slavery within its own limits,—to annul their own prohibitions of it, and to establish the law of slavery, like the law of property, as the immovable basis and foundation, not only of the Federal Government, but of every State and every community in the Union."

Certainly it would. But does *The Times* understand that "the people of the North" will inevitably accede to all that Mr. Wigfall demands, if they continue to concede that the Constitution recognizes slavery at all? Such is virtually the fact, though the logical sequences of it are not all reached at once. The progress made in that direction within the last few years, and still making, should assure all intelligent observers of this truth. The Dred Scott decision has brought "the question really at issue" very nearly to a close. The now pending suit of Virginia versus New York, in the case of Mr. Lemmon's slaves, is designed and expected to apply the principle of the Dred Scott decision to the rights of the States, and thus clinch the nail.

\* See the Lecompton Constitution for Kansas, concocted at Washington city, and also Pres. Buchanan's message concerning it.

VI. On one point, and in one direction, *The Times*, we fear, will have made its appeal in vain—"Such an endeavor," says *The Times*, as that of Mr. Wigfall, "is unworthy of Southern men, and ought to be, at once resented and resisted by them, from a feeling of self-respect." "It is a slander upon the Southern people, which they, themselves, should be the first to resent."

We agree with *The Times*, that it "is unworthy of Southern men," or of any other men, to hold human beings as property—and also that the imputation of it, "ought to be at once resented by them, from a feeling of self-respect"—if the statement of it is "a slander" being untrue. But we have very little hope that "Southern men" who are slaveholders, will be soon influenced by *The Times* to see the matter in this light. We are quite certain that they will not, until they conclude to give up the practice of slaveholding altogether. For they very well know that they cannot if they would, and would not if they could, give up their claim of absolute, unlimited property in slaves, while retaining them in slavery. The thing is too great an absurdity and self-contradiction, to be conceived, much less attempted.

*The Times* has itself, given a true account of the process by which the slaveholders have been confirmed and emboldened, in their claim of a constitutional recognition of their right of property in their slaves. It says:

"That the Federal Constitution recognizes slaves as property, appears to be a plausible and comparatively innocent proposition. It has been repeated so often; its truth has been so generally assumed, and even Northern men have so frequently conceded it as a matter of fact, that Southern men, not without reason, count upon establishing it as a point of constitutional law."

Very true. And "Northern men" have always done this, whenever they have conceded that the constitution recognizes slavery or slaves, at all. For the recognition of men women and children as "slaves" is the recognition of them as "property," nothing less, nothing more—for the very idea of a slave IS the idea of a piece of human property, and vice versa, the idea of property in a man, is the idea of his being a slave. The two cannot be distinguished or separated from each other.

And, whenever a party, platform, or candidate, conceding that the Constitution recognizes slaves and slavery, adds to this concession, the corresponding promise to "respect their constitutional rights," the promise, if the words mean anything intelligible, is a promise to respect the Constitutional right of property in man. This promise, consistently and truthfully carried out, into practice, would secure to the slaveholder all that is claimed by Mr. Wigfall—all that is described and deprecated by the *New York Times*. "The Southern men, not without reason," as *The Times* says, "counts upon establishing it as a point of constitutional law." And "not without reason" do they complain, and feel themselves ill-used and injured, when those who are forward to make these concessions and promises, refuse full and consistent conformity to them, and so patch up pettifogging and special pleading platforms, as does the Editor of the *Times*, (Mr. Raymond) at Pittsburgh, at Philadelphia, or at Chicago, to get rid of the fair logical results of their own concessions—

"To keep the word of promise to the ear,  
But break it to the hope."

Most indisputably and notoriously, it is the instinctive perception of this incongruity, and lack of fair dealing, that carries away the perverted and mistaken sympathies of so many Northern citizens in favor of the most extravagant Southern demands—demands that "appear to be plausible," when "so generally assumed," and so "frequently conceded, even by Northern men," by the Republican as well as the Democratic party, by the *Times* even in its opposition to Mr. WIGFALL.

VII. In conclusion. We see gleams of glorious light breaking through this remarkable editorial of the *N. Y. Times*. The truth on this subject, is beginning to force itself on the public attention. Even political editors begin to see men as trees, walking. The light reveals darkness visible, to be sure, but it is darkness in the background, retreating. The light is shining in darkness, while the darkness comprehends it not. Nevertheless it is shining. It is for those who know the truth, to walk in the light of it, and keep their light shining. Let Radical Political Abolitionists thank God and take courage. Let them stand up to their work and go

forward. Especially, let them beware of contradicting their professions by their votes.

For the Principia.

#### ERADICATION OF SLAVERY.

In considering this subject we shall not deem it necessary to enter upon a learned investigation, but to say a few things which we consider well founded both in philosophy and fact. The several schemes for the abolition of slavery promulgated by different men;—the Compromise system, the Squatter Sovereignty, the excluding slavery from New Territories, the purchasing slaves with the proceeds of the public domain &c., seem to be, and probably are, defective in the power to eradicate slavery. They have not done it, they probably will not do it. It is not in circumscribing slavery by geographical bounds that the evil can be removed. We think in the history of the world it never has done it, and probably it never can do it. The enlargement of freedom must not be in respect to territory, but in the exercise of human rights. When this can be done, the death of slavery may safely be announced.

If the people of the North would adopt this view, they would stand upon a basis that could not be moved. For, if as it is ascertained, the slaveholders are philanthropists, that they, in carrying out the system, are perfecting the civilization of a race, that it is for this purpose they have brought the Africans to this country, and that by this means they have civilized and enlightened four millions of a barbarous people, if all this has been done, and we are inclined to admit it, it must also be conceded that this people must now, after a tutelage of upwards of two hundred years, under the training of professed experts, be in a fit condition to enjoy some of the rights of a civilized race. To this view there can be no objection.

These Africans owe their masters nothing. When night comes the expense of the day's instruction is paid. The civilized have been amply supported for the beneficial influence they have exerted upon their uncivilized proteges. They have done well. They have carried on the work of enlightenment with both hand and heart, and mingled their own blood in the cause. The only question is, having been beneficent, shall they fail to be just? Shall they deny to those reclaimed savage men the rights they have been so long preparing them to enjoy? They have given them a new and better language, a new and better religion, and some knowledge of the arts and sciences. They have turned them from heathenism to Christianity, from barbarism to civilization, and now will they not give them legal rights commensurate with this improved social condition? We do not say, give them all the rights of freemen at once, but give them some of those rights. The right of property, the right to remain on the soil that gave them birth, the legal right to purchase their liberty, to purchase the liberty of their wives, their children, their fathers, their mothers. This we conceive to be the true system of gradual emancipation, a system that had freed Europe from the curse of feudal slavery, and can free America from the curse of African slavery. It has been efficient in the one case, it cannot fail to be so in the other. This is all we ask, but let us ask this, let us ask it of the South, as brethren, let us ask it as members of a great and good confederacy, let us ask it as co-philanthropists in the name of a common humanity, let us ask it as co-workers in a great cause of human civilization and human improvement, of human progress and human right.

T. H.

#### REVIEW OF THE PRECEDING.

Our correspondent has done well to repudiate the mere "Territorial" or "geographical" basis of operation that has deluded so many, for twelve years past. His communication furnishes us additional evidence that that delusion is in process of being dispelled. We may venture to predict that, within five year's time, the scheme of mere "non-extension," as a means of eradicating or restraining slavery, will have few, if any, intelligent advocates left.—But we would respectfully suggest to our correspondent that it would not be best, on the explosion of that bubble, to undertake the re-construction of the similar one, that underwent the scrutiny of the civilized world, was subjected to the test of experiment, and was generally exploded by honest philanthropists, and statesmen, above twenty years ago.—The impossibility of a "gradual" transition from the condition of "chattels personal" to the condition of free men, was first demonstrated by ethical philosophy, and then demonstrated over again, by the actual attempt in Jamaica.

A slave is held solely as "property." That is the tenure by which he is held. While remaining a slave he cannot

hold property. To allow him to hold property, as our correspondent proposes, is to emancipate him from chattel slavery, and to declare him no longer a chattel, but a man, under the protection of law, both for his person and for his property. This gives him access to the courts, with the right to sue, and under the liability to be sued. The "legal right to purchase his liberty" would be the right to make "a contract," and this right, as it implies freedom, can belong only to a free man and can never belong to a slave. A master of a slave woman, having incautiously given his consent to the marriage of his female slave to a free man, found, on enquiry that he had emancipated her, and had no legal claim upon her. Volumes of demonstration might again be piled up, on this point, as they have been. But "practical business men" as they call themselves, would not be thus satisfied. They must witness the experiment. And they did witness it, to their heart's content. The British act of emancipation, drawn up by themselves, with their utmost skill, prescribed a "gradual" process, under the name of "apprenticeship," the best plan of the kind, doubtless, as it was boasted to be, that had ever been devised. The several colonies had the privilege of choosing either the gradual or the immediate process as they pleased, only upon this condition that the compensation money would not be forth-coming until the emancipation was completed. Under the stimulus of this motive, the colonial authorities of Antigua and Bermuda made the emancipation complete and immediate, thereupon receiving their quota of the money. The Jamaica planters, on the other hand, being mostly indebted to mortgages in England, to whom instead of themselves, the compensation money would be paid, preferred the apprenticeship.—And now for the result. Antigua and Bermuda passed, at once, from slavery to complete freedom, with perfect order, ease and mutual good feeling, on all hands, and there has been no complaint, since. Jamaica found the apprenticeship a source of mutual exasperation, and gave it up as "impracticable" long before the time fixed by the British Parliament had expired. Thus did the experiment vindicate the theory of the immediateists, and compel the gradualists to confess their mistake. The political literature of both hemispheres, at the time, including the productions of the pen of Edward Everett, acknowledged the splendid success of the experiment. It was attested by the Colonial Legislatures, and by the principal planters themselves. It was affirmed by both Houses of Parliament. It was proclaimed by the Executive Government, over the signature of VICTORIA, from the British throne. The question was considered settled, for all time.

Our correspondent's allusion to the gradual decay of feudalism in Europe, fails of meeting the point. The cases are not parallel. The old feudalism was not slavery. The serf was not a chattel personal. He was regarded as a man. He constituted the military defence of his country, and proudly partook of the military glory of his clan and of his chieftain. American slavery consists wholly in the assumed ownership of the slave as a chattel personal. The tenure cannot be gradually relaxed. It must either be retained, rigorously, to the letter, and acted out, in its spirit, or be relinquished altogether. The moment "the exercise of human rights" in any direction, is accorded to him, that moment the slave feels that he is no longer a slave, and—there being no usages of serf-dom to bind him—he claims all the rights of a man. Thus it proved in Jamaica, and thus it would prove here, if tried over again.

The American planters understand all this. The experiment of gradualism will never be made over again, where the English language and literature are known. It is too late in the day, for that. Americans, if not held as slaves, will be free. Our correspondent himself seems to have a glimpse of this, when he says that "When this can be done" (i. e. when slaves can be allowed "the exercise of human rights") "the death of slavery may be safely announced."—Of course it may, for the work will have been already done! And the process will have been immediatism, not gradualism.

The slave must first be liberated from chattelhood. His condition may then be improved, as was the condition of the European serf.

KIDNAPPING IN KANSAS.—An organized band of kidnappers is, at the present time, keeping the colored population of Kansas in constant alarm. Their victims are selected principally from among the Arkansas exiles, who a few

years since, were driven from that State, and took up their abode in Kansas. Their free papers are taken from them by the kidnappers and destroyed, and they are then coerced into the admission that they are runaway slaves, when they taken into Missouri, and sold for a more Southern market. Very little effort apparently, is made to stop these nefarious operations.—Times.

For The Principia.

#### NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.

NUMBER VIII.

What is the nature of that State Right that lies in the way of a National Abolition of slavery? If such a question is entitled to be treated with any respect, it cannot be for its own sake. Unsophisticated common sense at once decides that the right in question cannot exist. All rights harmonize, and a State right that conflicts with the general right of society to establish justice, is impossible. The right of a State to maintain slavery cannot be a moral right, for of what moral precept is not slavery a perpetual violation? It cannot be a political right, for the express objects of our political union are justice and liberty.

Besides, to talk of a political right to trample on the rights of humanity and interfere with moral duties, is to affront the understanding. It cannot be the right of security, for of all things, slavery is the most prolific of danger. It cannot be the right to promote the public welfare, for slavery is just the thing to fill a community with trouble and misery. And States that instinctively cling to the Federal arm, on the appearance of danger, should be the last to talk of the right of independence. What, then, is the right? Those who speak of it should either explain it, so as to make it intelligible to common sense, or else they should own that they have suffered themselves to be fooled by the senseless dicta of slaveholders. If they insist upon using the term right as applicable to slavery, let them add such epithets as will make their meaning appear, if they have any meaning. Let them call it the tyrannical right, the right of oppression, the right of lawlessness, the right to prohibit marriage, the right of licentiousness, the right of cruelty, or the right against all rights.

It may be said that a State Government has a right to do its own business, without foreign interference. It certainly has such a right, and so long as it continues to do its own business by administering justice and protecting the weak against outrage, its right of non-interference is sacred. But should it cease to discharge the appropriate duties of government, and go to interfering with the rights of humanity, there will then be a plain right of humanity to interfere with that government.

What is the true expression of this notion of State Rights and non-interference which we are combating? It is this! "Whatever has the form and name of a State Government, is so sacred that it must not be interfered with, even though it should sanction all the atrocities of slavery." Who that values a reputation for good sense, would maintain such a proposition? And yet what sensible man can analyze the notion and find it anything else? If ruffians, without the sanction of Government, practice any one of the outrages of slavery, they are open to governmental interference. But if these same ruffians get possession of a territory and institute a thing they call a State Government, and enact things they call State laws, they may practice all the outrages of slavery under the shelter of State rights! Can any absurdity beat this? Surely the superstition of State Rights will astonish posterity, quite as much as any of the weaknesses of our pilgrim fathers.

I. S.

Mr. Thaddeus Hyatt makes a statement of the Distribution of the John Brown Fund, in the Tribune of the 26th. The total amount thus far raised in this country for the family of John Brown, the illustrious and noble martyr, is only \$6,150. The Haytian fund is considerably less than this—the public having misconceived the sum contributed in Hayti—Haytian dollars being a great deal less than our dollars. Mr. Hyatt's part of the fund, which he raised by means of his photograph, is \$2,600. The whole sum—the \$6,150—is divided as follows: The widow and three younger children, \$2,250; John Brown Jr., \$1000; Mary Ann, widow of Thompson, \$500—the balance among the other sons and widows and some of the other sufferers of the John Brown party.

Mr. H. says that about 800 persons assembled at the grave of John Brown, on Independence Day, and, standing upon the great rock that marks his grave, re-affirmed his principles! The hero sleeps in his granite tomb under the shadow of the Adirondacks, but his example lives and his principles die not!—True Amer.

# The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 4, 1860.

## THE NEW OUTBURST.

For some time past, it has been seen by Abolitionists who are in the habit of watching the aspects of the moral horizon, that dark heavy clouds were rolling up, laden with heavy thunders against radical honest abolitionism. The course of abolitionists themselves, their supineness, their readiness to submit to compromises, and to political and ecclesiastical absorption with their enemies, has done much to bring them into contempt, and to invite fresh attacks. Some, who have been leaders, have virtually beat a retreat. Some have openly gone back, and have heralded to the world, that the day of associated anti-slavery effort outside of the Church, has passed its meridian, that the day of anti-slavery agitation within the church has passed its meridian, that the day of political abolition has passed its meridian, that the day of moral suasion abolition has passed its meridian, that the day of church action against slavery, has passed its meridian. Editors who love to have it so, have proclaimed to the four winds that "the exciting or excommunicating of slaveholders, as a principle of church discipline, is almost universally repudiated."

And this is not all. Leading abolitionists, true at heart, have given up to the spirit of discouragement. Simultaneously with their reproofs of apostacy, they have unguardedly helped to excite that fear and despondency that "admitted into public councils, betrays, like treason." Even while calling on abolitionists to rally against the enemy, they have, ever and anon, allowed their trumpet to give an uncertain sound, by proclaiming their apprehensions that all efforts will prove unavailing, and that the sun of American freedom is to go down, in eclipse, into an ocean of blood. The cartridge-box has been glorified at the expense of faith in God's word has been exchanged for faith in the sword. The demand for immediate, unconditional, national abolition, if not withdrawn, has been covered over with changeful and varying expedients, non-extension, separation, compensation, and what not. Thus much for indications within. It would be strange if they were not followed by corresponding indications from without.

Senator Douglas engrafts upon his Popular Sovereignty, allegiance to the Dred Scott decision by which Popular Sovereignty is declared unconstitutional, and proposes a Federal enactment for punishing conspiracies against the securing of liberty in the States. The Republican party, true to its policy of coming as near to the Democratic party as it can, without disbanding and joining it, is forward to profess fealty to the fugitive slave bill, and to promise its enforcement by Federal power, instead of resisting it by Federal action, either in Massachusetts, New York, or Wisconsin. Instead of courting abolition votes, it now bids them defiance. *The Times* throws off all disguise, and boasts that the Republican party is the only party that, in virtue of its influence with "the anti-slavery element" that goes into its composition, is able "to COERCE it into acquiescence." This, then is the prospect before us. If Breckenridge is elected, we have the reign of Buchanan extended. If Douglas is elected, we have the Dred Scott decision enforced, and a Federal enactment to punish "conspiracies" against slavery. If Lincoln is elected, we have the enforcement of the fugitive slave bill, and "the anti-slavery element" of the party that elected him, "COERCED" yes! that is the word—"COERCED into ACQUIESCENCE"! Where is the choice between the three?

In the religious horizon, equally dark are the portents. Just at this crisis, Dr. CHEEVER and the CHURCH OF THE PURITANS, are the chief troublers in Israel. For some time past, there has been, evidently, a determination to break them down, in some way, and at whatever expense. If it cost treachery; if it cost falsehood; if it cost dissimulation, if it cost perjury; if it cost fire and blood; if it cost the scenes of St. Bartholomew's eve—no matter, the price must be paid. We remember the scenes of 1834, when the Mayor of Brooklyn, sent a friendly message to our family, at midnight, that we must leave the city before morning, if we

would be safe. We were not taken by surprise, we needed not the message, for we had watched the ecclesiastical portents. We have lived to watch them again, and to recognize them.

We mean just what we say, and the whole of it. The spirit that aims a dirk at the character of Dr. CHEEVER would aim one at his vitals, if it dared. There is a meanness and a malignity in the sacerdotal assassin, before which the fiendishness of the vulgar ordinary assassin pales. It takes education, erudition, social standing, reputation for piety, orthodoxy, and even anti-slavery, to strike the blow that Satan has determined to strike now. He has his tools. He knows his men. And they are ready and well-trained.

Forewarned is forearmed. We wish not to alarm any one, but we do wish the friends of freedom throughout the country, to open their eyes upon the storm, and not be taken by surprise at the outburst. For ourselves we welcome the tempest. Let it come. We long for another, and the final battle, before we lay down our arms. We were never more hopeful. The prize we have been for more than a quarter of a century, fighting for, is almost within our reach. But there must be one more final struggle. There needs nothing but faith in God's word. We shall conquer. But it will cost a struggle against a fiercer and more demonic attack than the cause of the enslaved has yet encountered.

THE NOMINATING CONVENTION—CHANGE OF TIME.—It will be seen, by a notice in this paper that the time of holding the Nominating Convention at Syracuse, is changed to Wednesday, August 29th, at 10 o'clock A.M.

The notice of the change reached us, last week, while our paper was in process of printing. We immediately stopped the press, and made the alteration. But, as about one-third of the edition was already worked off, a considerable portion of our subscribers were not notified of the change.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS.

"OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS."—Our new Edition is now on hand, and for sale. See Advertisement, on our last column. What portion of our voting citizens have a copy of the Constitution of their country?

SERMONS AND DISCOURSES, BY BERAH GREEN.—N. York, S. W. Green, No. 18 Jacob Street, 1860. We have just received a copy from the publisher. It is a handsomely executed volume of 556 pages 12 mo., with an excellent engraved likeness of the distinguished author. We have glanced over it sufficiently to see that it contains some of his most valuable productions, particularly "Iniquity and a meeting," "Slavery not in the New Testament," "Personality and property." We expected, of course, to find in the volume some things from which we earnestly dissent, and are not disappointed. On perusing it we may find more. Be that as it may, the greater part of it, we feel confident, accords with our own views of truth, and of the wants of the age. The three articles above specified, are worth more than most volumes of that size, and the whole deserves the attention of earnest thinkers, as coming from one of the most honest, earnest, and strong minded thinkers of the age.

HOSACK'S TRIAL.—"Report of the trial of John Hosack, indicted for rescuing a fugitive slave from the U. S. Deputy Marshall, at Ottawa, (Ill.) Oct. 20, 1859. Chicago Press and Tribune office, 1860." We thank Mr. Hosack for a copy of this report. It forms a pamphlet, or book, of 265 pages, including the Testimony, and the Pleas on both sides. The jury returned a verdict of guilty, and a motion was made for an arrest of judgment and a new trial. The argument for the motion closes the pamphlet. The decision of the Court on the motion is not stated.

This is one of the documents that will be read with amazement by posterity, if preserved for their perusal. That a country where such things transpire should have been denominated "the land of liberty," "a christian country," will appear strangest of all.

It is found that the prairie stone, existing in such large quantities just back of Chicago, will make gas as well and as freely as the best coal, yield 50 per cent of pure saltpeter, and a residue be left of as good lime as can be found anywhere. Won't there be a balance that will do for "currency" out West?—*Scientific Amer.*

## NOTICE.

WEDNESDAY 29th of AUGUST, is the time finally agreed upon for holding the RADICAL ABOLITION CONVENTION at Syracuse.

The Convention will meet at 10 o'clock, A. M., to nominate candidates for President and Vice President of the United States; also to nominate candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor of this State.

The men and women of this, and other States, who occupy radical positions in Anti-Slavery and Temperance, are earnestly invited to attend, and take part in this convention.

W. W. CHAPMAN,  
J. C. HARRINGTON,  
OTIS SIMMONS.

Central  
Committee.

MINETTO, N. Y. July 5th, 1860.

We cordially concur in the above call for a Convention; and we hope it will be attended by hundreds of earnest men and women.

We believe in a religion of justice and mercy, and we cannot consent to apostatize from it at the ballot-box more than elsewhere.

We believe that man was made to love God and his fellow man, and we cannot consent to trample upon beautiful and glorious human nature at the ballot-box more than elsewhere.

These being our beliefs, we sternly refuse to vote for candidates who are opposed to suppressing the dramshop, that most prolific source of degradation and danger to man and of blasphemous insult to God.

So do we refuse to vote for candidates who would send back to slavery the brother or sister who had escaped from that hell of horrors. So do we refuse to vote for candidates who would make the social, civil, or political rights of one variety of the human family even a hair's-breadth less than those enjoyed by another.

So in short do we refuse to vote for any candidate who would recognize a law for slavery, any more than a law for murder.

## Signed.

ONTARIO Co., N. Y.—J. W. Duffin, George Lincoln, Samuel Crandal, George T. Fisher.

ONANDAGA Co., N. Y.—John P. Belker, T. G. White, M. Merrick, Charles Merrick, William Cooper, C. D. B. Mills.

WYOMING Co.—R. W. Lyman, L. P. Frost, H. N. Waldo, F. B. Bushnell, O. Hitchcock.

FULTON Co.—A. S. Leaton, Reussalear Livingston, Wm. M. Harris.

MADISON Co.—Samuel Breese, Otis Simmons, Gerrit S. Simmons, Horace Simmons, Lafayette Simmons, Ezra Campbell, Ezra Campbell Jr., Otis Campbell, Gerrit Smith, Horace Stowell, A. Lewis, Geo. W. Putnam, Pixley Center, Noah Tyler, Charles Lewis, Albert Lewis, Caleb Calkins, George Lewis, Silas T. Fyler, James Ferguson, Silas Keller, Silas B. Fyler, Joseph Fancher, Wm. A. Babcock.

OSWEGO Co.—John B. Edwards, Hamilton Littlefield.

LEWIS Co.—Olney Place.

JEFFERSON Co.—Joseph Osborn.

CAYUGA Co.—Henry Collins, Archibald Green, John Mitchell, John W. Sawyer, Abner A. Armstrong.

CORTLAND Co.—Victor Kingsley, Luther Wellington, M. I. Palmer, Cyrus P. Grosvenor, Silas Hammond.

CATTARAUGUS Co.—Wm. Shattuck, Sylvester Caswell, Otis Hitchcock, Truman Hitchcock, David Strong, Darius Bowing, Timothy Everit, Alvan Plumley, Solomon Nichols, Frederick Dexter, Franklin Nichols, Numan Nichols, Phineas Noble, Nelson Boardman.

KNOX Co., OHIO.—Rev. T. B. Dawson, Robert Dawson, R. Welsh, R. W. Welsh, John Boyd, Henry Chandler, S. B. Dodd, M.D., W. P. Pierson, Rev. Joseph Whitham, S. B. Cline, Joseph A. McFarland.

WASHINGTON Co., PENN.—George Buchanan, E. T. Agnew, Samuel McFarland.

STATE OF ILLINOIS.—J. W. Mahan.

## GREELEY'S PLATFORM.

A spirited political correspondence between Horace Greeley and Washington Hunt, has drawn out the following from Mr. Greeley.

"You ask if any guaranty would induce me to abandon my 'system of slavery agitation.' Your phraseology is vague, but my answer shall be frank and full. Believing slavery to be a flagrant violation of the inalienable Rights of Man, a burning reproach to our country, an enemy to her prosperity and progress in art, intelligence and civilization, I mean to labor for its eradication from our own and all other countries, as long as I live. But, recognizing the right of each State to regulate its own domestic concerns, I stand ready to forego and desist from all political action respecting slavery, from the moment the slave States shall disclaim all intention, forego all effort, to extend their 'peculiar institution' beyond their own limits. Thenceforward, I will oppose slavery in Virginia or elsewhere, exactly as I oppose intemperance or gambling there—not otherwise."

A Mr. Greeley's party is not pledged against receiving

more slave States, as his Presidential Candidate says he sees no way in which their admission can be avoided—and as the Tribune favors Mr. Eli Thayer's Squatter Sovereignty platform for the Territories, we do not understand why Mr. Greeley talks of desisting from anti-slavery agitation on the conditions above mentioned. We see not how he can politically keep up any anti-slavery agitation at all.

## News of the Day.

### CASE OF BOOTH.

Another application to the Supreme Court, was made last week, for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to release or remove S. M. Booth. The same application was made to the full Bench, that was presented to Judge Paine, in Milwaukee, of which transaction we spoke last week.—The points raised, our readers will remember, were that the U. S. had no authority to imprison for an indefinite period, simply for a non-payment of fine, when the prisoner was actually unable to pay; and that they had no power to imprison persons convicted, even under laws conceded to be constitutional, but in the prisons or jails of the State, except in such States as had refused the use of their prisons to U. S. convicts. This State never having so refused, it was claimed that Mr. Booth was not imprisoned legally.

Judge Paine again vacated the Bench, leaving the case in the hands of Judges Dixon and Cole. The Writ was not granted, through a disagreement of the Judges. Just what we expected; just what logically grows out of the position taken by Judge Dixon from the first. A Judge who believes that a State is so far subordinated to the dictum of the United States Court, that its Supreme Judiciary cannot interfere to arrest the execution of a law, in his opinion "clearly unconstitutional," as Judge Dixon has already said, cannot be expected to interfere at any subsequent stage of the proceedings, whatever may be the provocation. The painful contingencies that grow out of the execution of a statute, are, of course, subordinate to the main question—the power to punish. Conceding away the power to interfere on the main point, takes with it the power to interfere on minor details. This being the case, we can appreciate the wisdom of making the application only as viewed in this light—it demonstrates anew to the people of the State, that Judge Paine's presence on the Bench, blocks the wheels of justice, and that no relief can reasonably be looked for, while he remains Supreme Judge, and refuses to act.—*Fond du Lac Com.*

GREAT is power, especially when exercised by and in behalf of despotism and wrong! It is known that Sherman M. Booth is now confined in the U. S. Custom House at Milwaukee, for the virtue of violating the Fugitive Slave enactment—for doing as he would be done by, in aiding the escape of a fellow-man who had fallen among thieves.—The other day, Booth's father called to see his son in prison, but the Marshal refused to allow the old man the privilege! The same official afterwards also refused to let a friend of Booth's present him with a box of strawberries! And we declare that this is in America, not Barbary! You see, reader, it makes all the difference in the world with our despots, whether their victims are imprisoned for actual horrid crimes or for deeds of christianity and mercy! If Sherman M. Booth were confined for MURDER would the U. S. Marshal deny him the luxury of a box of strawberries? By no means.—*True American.*

### Still later—Rescue of Booth:

WILWAUKEE, Wednesday, Aug. 1, 1860.

Sherman M. Booth, who was arrested some time since, and who had been awaiting his trial, in the Glover/Rescue case, was taken from the room of the Custom-House, where he was confined, at noon to-day, by ten armed men, who placed him in a carriage they had in readiness, which drove off with him into the country. The United States Marshal and his deputies were at dinner at the time. The jailer was silenced by threats of violence, and locked up in the room, in place of the prisoner.

IMPORTANT DECISION.—The Chicago Democrat says: "The United States District Court, at its late session in this city, decided that executions issued in favor of non-residents, against a citizen of this State, could be levied on the homestead of the defendant, in spite of the State law to the contrary. The decision is that United States Courts are not obliged to take cognizance in all cases of State laws, and that the law of the State where the plaintiff resides is to be taken into consideration in rendering judgments."

### THE WAR ON DR. CHEEVER.

Altogether the most important domestic news afloat is the war against Dr. CHEEVER and THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS. We give some further documentary records of that warfare.

#### I. Dr. Cheever and the N. Y. Observer.

##### LETTER FROM DR. CHEEVER.

To the Editor of the New York Observer:

On the eve of my departure for Europe, a friend has shown me an editorial in your paper, designed to prejudice the people of Great Britain against me, containing an affidavit from a person whom you do not name, to the effect that the wife of that person had been for many years a slaveholder in Christian membership in the Church of the Puritans, and that I knew it. There is also in the *Independent* of the same week an article containing the following allegation: "It is a well attested fact that, for nearly ten years a slaveholder was a member in full communion in Dr. Cheever's church, and instead of being disciplined, though the case was known to the officers of the church, was recently (1860) dismissed by letter as in good standing."

This is a new concoction of old falsehoods in regard to which I shall now simply present the following extract from a letter of mine, which was published in *Edinburgh* in the month of April last, referring to a

"Tissue of absolute falsehoods concerning a slaveholder having been admitted to my church, and kept in it with my knowledge and consent, I all the while preaching against slaveholding as a crime against God and man, set in the same catalogue with the crime of murder. The whole charge is an entire falsehood, grounded on the single circumstance of a lady from the Methodist Church, but originally from a slaveholding family in Kentucky, having joined my church in this city, and then quitted it in the year 1856, about the time when my discourse in reprobation of the outrage against Senator Sumner, and in defence of free speech against Slavery, was delivered. This lady was not known by us to have been a slaveholder, and I believe never was such, except by having had a slave girl given her by her parents for her maid and attendant in her childhood. When this lady married, and left her home, that slave woman was retained by her parents at the homestead in Kentucky."

Now the certificate published in your paper states the certifying gentleman's wife was a Slaveholder in my church, and that I knew it. I therefore hereby declare that this lady was received into the Church of the Puritans, without any person in the Church, that I know of, being aware of her being a slaveholder; and up to the time of her leaving the church in 1856, I am not aware of any persons in the church being acquainted with that fact, of which her husband now appears in public to bear witness. He never told me of it, nor ever testified of it to the church, neither have I known anything, at any time, but the above-mentioned circumstances, nor ever came even to so much knowledge as is involved in that, concerning what her husband now testifies as to her condition, until about the time of her leaving the church. The name of the husband of the lady, whose certificate as to the bona fide slaveholding qualifications of his wife, the *New-York Observer* parades in its editorial columns, I suppose to be Lees, since the lady, whose connection with the Church of the Puritans I have noted above is named in our church manual as Mrs. Susan P. Lees.

I cannot see how we could have known of her being a slaveholder, unless her husband had appeared before the church and testified, as he now does before the public, or had informed the pastor or the officers or members of the church. For there was not the slightest intimation of her being a slaveholder, in her letter from the Methodist Church, and she came to us a stranger, and never made known to me any of her investments, if such she held, as her husband now intimates, of property in human beings.

This lady left our church in 1856. The editor of the *Independent* declares that it is a well-attested fact that a slaveholder (meaning doubtless, this lady) was for nearly ten years in communion with the church, the officers of the church knowing her as a slaveholder, and was dismissed in 1860. What witnesses the *Independent* may have summoned, I cannot tell, nor what records its editors may have consulted for their well-attested facts, unless it be the columns of the *Observer*. Neither can I tell what possible advantage either the one paper or the other expects to gain, either against the Church of the Puritans or myself, even supposing there had been such a thing tolerated in that church as the membership of a slaveholder previous to the year 1856, if at that time the application of divine truth became too pungent to be endured, and if, since then, the church and the pastor have practiced that truth more faithfully maintaining that slaveholding, under all circumstances, is sinful, and ought not to be permitted in any Christian church, nor any fellowship tolerated with slaveholders. On the contrary, our preaching is more impressive and powerful now than ever, if we have been brought out of slaveholding darkness into the clear light, and we have a double right to preach against slaveholding, by virtue of having tested the efficacy of such preaching, in the manifestation of sin, and confession of the sinner.

GEORGE B. CHEEVER.

#### REPLY BY THE EDITORS OF THE OBSERVER.

I. We are assured, and we believe, that George B. Cheever, pastor of the Church of the Puritans, knew well, by repeated conversations with the lady, that she was a slave-

holder in her own right, owning many slaves for her own benefit, and deriving therefrom the means which she employed in the support of the said Cheever as her pastor in this City.

2. We are assured, and we believe, that the said Cheever was in the habit, after preaching violently against slaveholding, of going to her house and seeking to appease her wounded feelings by his conversation.

3. We are assured, and we believe, that this slaveholder received from the said Cheever, a certificate of dismission in good and regular standing, when he knew that she was a slaveholder; and he was teaching the same doctrine on the subject that he now professes to hold.

4. We are assured, and we believe, that the said Cheever's statement above made, is utterly unworthy of credit, being contrary to well-known facts, and expressly contradicted by the certificate of a gentleman of unimpeachable character, and the statements also of the lady, whose good standing the said Cheever testified when she left his Church.

5. We do not "design to prejudice the people of Great Britain against" this man. The British people love to be humbugged, as the Americans do. They will receive G. B. Cheever as a genuine Abolitionist. They will gather in crowds to hear him denounce his country—the mother that bore him. But we wish the British and the American people to know what his Abolitionism is worth, and that is, nothing at all. He may be sincere in denying the facts we have proved respecting him—facts which have been before the public six months without being denied by him, though he has been repeatedly called upon to do so if he could. But if he is sincere in his denial, we can only lament that he does not recollect facts which are familiar to others, and that he no longer reasons correctly from premises to obvious conclusions. We trust that repose in Switzerland will restore him to consciousness of the truth, and that he will then recall the denial which we publish above.

6. As to the statements made by another paper, we have nothing to say. The facts which we have stated are susceptible of proof in any civil or ecclesiastical tribunal, and the names of the parties who have made the statements are at the service of any person who wishes to challenge the testimony.

7. Since the above was in type, a gentleman has called upon us who was an officer of the Church of the Puritans at the time that the lady referred to was a member; he tells that Dr. Cheever knew the fact of her being a slaveholder, and often conversed with him on the subject; that the officers of the church knew it also, and that all the facts we have stated and many more will be substantiated by the most indisputable evidence.

#### II. Echo of the Times.

Two of the former officers of Rev. Dr. Cheever's Church add their explicit testimony to the truth of the statement, which he has publicly contradicted, to the effect that during the whole course of his Anti-Slavery denunciations, he permitted a slaveholder to remain a member of his Church. Their evidence on this point is direct and unmistakable. They assert that the fact was known to them and to many other members of the Church, and that Dr. Cheever himself was perfectly aware of the views and relations of the slaveholding member in question, and repeatedly disclaimed all intention of referring to her in his denunciations of slaveholders. Here is a clear and explicit issue of personal veracity between Dr. Cheever and a number of members of his own Church, known to the community as men of character. His position in the matter is certainly unenviable.

#### III. Back Track of the Independent.

The *Independent's* attack of July 12, on Dr. CHEEVER and "the CHURCH OF THE PURITANS" having stirred up "The World"—"the Observer" and "the Times" to second its efforts—the *Independent*, true to its Janus-face instincts and policy, turns round, July 16, and administers severe castigations upon each of its echoes. They had perhaps, imprudently, over-done their part, not intermingling their stabs with any professions of friendship—nor their proslavery with semblances of abolitionism. It would not do for the *Independent* to appear identified with such. It would lose its hold on the abolitionists of this country, and retain no power to influence those of great Britain. We have not room for the article, here, but its scope will be inferred from the following.

#### IV. Reply of the Times to the Independent, Dr. Cheever and Slavery.

The *Independent* is evidently inclined to keep Dr. Cheever exclusively for its own castigation. It has been very severe upon his course in soliciting British aid in support of his church, but is greatly distressed that the *Times* should have given heed to its own statement that he permitted a slaveholder to belong to his church, while he was denouncing slaveholding as a crime. The *Independent* dwells especially upon the fact that Dr. C.'s accusers in this are anonymous,—although the lady, who was the slaveholder referred to, is herself the authority for what has been said. It is true, as our neighbor alleges, that Dr. C. is a clergyman, and that his veracity should not, therefore, be

lightly questioned. But the *Independent* will very cheerfully concede that he is not infallible and that his assertions are not to be taken as conclusive in his own behalf, against the testimony of others, equally respectable.

We publish below a letter from two gentlemen, who have been officers in Dr. Cheever's Church, and whose character stands unimpeached in this community. They refer to other gentlemen of equal position as additional witnesses to the truth of what they state. Perhaps the *Independent* will consider their averments as worthy of attention, even against the statements of Dr. Cheever. The following is their letter, addressed to the Editors of the *Observer*.

Messrs. Editors: You have called our attention to "Dr. Cheever's Denial" (in your last paper) in the matter of the slaveholding member in the Church of the Puritans, in which Church we were officers, and one of us from its foundation.

We notice he says the member came from "a Methodist Church," and "never made known to me (him) any of her investments, if such she held, as her husband now intimates, of her property in human beings." This denial is also very indignantly made in the report of his speech published in the *Tribune* of the 14th inst., and by his authority in an editorial in the *Anti-Slavery Standard* of this City of March last.

We are greatly surprised that Dr. C. should make this denial.

The following statement made recently to one of us in presence of witnesses, by the member in question, is to the point:

"I joined the Church of the Puritans by letter from the McCord Presbyterian Church, Lexington, Kentucky,—was never a member of a Methodist Church. Dr. Cheever, for years before I left the Church, knew by frequent conversations with me, that I was the owner of slaves. Several times after preaching his strong Anti-Slavery sermons, he came directly to my house to assure me he had no application to me in his preaching on the subject, and did not wish me to feel that he applied his preaching on this subject to me."

The fact that this lady, (who was a faithful teacher in the Sabbath-school, and a most worthy and active member,) was an owner of slaves during the term of her membership, was well known to ourselves and families, and was frequently the topic of conversation with her and other members of the Church. Indeed, there was no attempt to conceal it.

Her request for a letter of dismission and recommendation was presented by the pastor himself, at one of the regular evening meetings of the church, in November or December of 1856. No objection being made by the pastor, or any member, it was issued, according to the usual custom, at the expiration of a week.

Among the members who knew or had heard, before the letter was issued, of her owning slaves, we name by their own consent, (with the exception of Mr. Phelps, who is absent,) Henry A. Hurlbut, Charles Abernethy, George D. Phelps, Rev. Dr. John J. Owen, and their families, and Deacon Wm. H. Smith. Deacon Smith was an officer in the church, and recollects distinctly before he went to reside in Europe, in 1852, it was understood in the church that this lady was an owner of slaves.

We deeply regret the occasion for this note, but our past relations to a church once dear to us, and the vindication of historical truth, demand so much at our hands.

O. E. WOOD.

E. M. KINGSLEY.

NEW YORK, July 21.

We are at a loss to explain the complaints of the *Independent* in this matter just now, inasmuch as that paper was of the first to direct public attention to the subject. It said, only a fortnight since, that "it is a well-attested fact that for nearly ten years a slaveholder was a member in full communion in Dr. Cheever's Church, and instead of being disciplined, though the case was made known to the officers of the church, was recently dismissed by letter in good standing." This is quite as much,—indeed, it is all that we have said; and it is fully sustained by the testimony of the two Deacons of Dr. C.'s Church, which is given above.—*Times*.

Thus are the tongues of Dr. Cheever's enemies divided, among and against themselves, and in the case of *The Independent*, against itself, discrediting its own testimony, when repeated by another. It will require regiments of such witnesses to outweigh Dr. Cheever.

## EUROPE.

St. John's, N. F., Friday July 27, 1860.

The steamship *City of Washington*, from Liverpool 18th, via Queenstown 10th inst., passed Cape Race on her way to New-York at 4 o'clock this morning.

The news yacht of the Associated Press succeeded in obtaining the Cape Race canister, which contained however, no summary of news, but merely two newspapers from which the following summary of the European intelligence is compiled:

### MESSAGES AT DAMASCUS.

The British Government is said to have received intelligence of a fearful massacre of Christians at Damascus. Five hundred were killed, among whom was the Dutch Consul. The American Consul was wounded.

### NAPLES AND SICILY.

The two vessels which passed over to Garibaldi are merchant steamers.

It is confirmed that the steamer *Veloce* has passed over to Garibaldi.

NAPLES, 14th.—Patrols are constantly traveling the streets. The moderate party is fully of apprehensions concerning the stabbing of an inspector of the former police, on the 12th, in the strada de Tolda.

A proclamation of Garibaldi, against the Bourbon dynasty, has been distributed. He says: "I am a royalist, but I prefer Victor Emanuel, who will head us against Austria."

NAPLES, via Turin 17th.—There has been a conflict between the troops and the people, in consequence of popular manifestations in favor of some refugees who had disembarked at Naples. Several persons were killed.

The Ministry has been dismissed, and a new Cabinet formed.

The steamship *Sazonia*, from Southampton on the 18th, arrived at this port yesterday, and the *Bohemian*, from Liverpool and Londonderry on the 19th, also arrived yesterday at Quebec. The intelligence by these arrivals is late and interesting. Particulars are received of the massacre of Christians at Damascus by the Druses. It is greatly feared that Fund Pacha will not be able to arrest the tide of bloodshed, in which case France and England will interfere peremptorily. Russia, also, has expressed a desire to act in concert with the Western Powers. The Russian Cabinet reiterates its opinion that the events now transpiring in Syria hold in suspense the peace of the world, and that the very existence of Turkey is at stake. The Emperor Napoleon had received a letter from the Sultan, assuring that he will use all the power at his command to restore order in Syria. All the accounts agree in saying that more massacres are contemplated, and will occur, if not prevented with a strong hand.

The news from Italy is not of an important character. It is confirmed that Farini and others have been banished by Garibaldi. The decree of banishment states that they conspired against public order. Naples was unquiet, and several disturbances had taken place. A Papal allocation protests against the Piedmontese Government for the arrest and condemnation of the Bishops of Pisa and Piacenza.—*Times* of Tuesday.

European advices, five days later, are received by the arrival of the steamship *Prince Albert* at St. John's, N. F., en route for this port, from Galway, on the 24th inst. Active preparations for an armed intervention were making by France, and it was reported that Russia also had expressed a desire to co-operate with France and England, in the restoration of order. The Turkish Sultan had written to both France and England, expressing his grief for what had transpired, and promising to make an effort to re-establish order. From Naples we learn that the Ministry had concluded to withdraw their resignations, the King having taken measures in accordance with their desires. Still further concessions had also been ordered by the Government, such as the removal of the Royal Guard, the abolition of the punishment of the bastinado, and the discontinuance of the custom of imprisonment in secret dungeons. No further fighting in Sicily is mentioned. Garibaldi had announced his intention to annex Sicily to Sardinia. Advices from China to June 7, are received. It is announced that hostilities were about to commence; and in connection with this fact, it was reported that a Russian army of 12,000 men were marching on Peking. This report, however, needs confirmation.—*Times*.

### SYRIA.

PARIS, July 19.—The *Moniteur* says the Sultan has addressed the following letter to the Emperor, of the 16th July:

"I have at heart that your Majesty should know with what grief I have learned the events in Syria. Let your Majesty be convinced that I shall employ all my powers for establishing security and order in Syria—that I shall severely punish the guilty parties, whoever they may be, and render justice to all. In order to leave no doubt whatever on the intentions of my Government, I have intrusted that important mission to my Minister for Foreign Affairs, with whose principles your Majesty is acquainted."

LONDON, July 19.—The *Valetta*, with the Bombay mail, arrived at Marseilles, at 9½ p. m. yesterday.

A telegram from the scientific party in Spain says, "Success is complete. We have two photographs of red flame, which prove that they belong to the sun, and many photographs of other phases."

It is reported in Paris, that the French Government have received a communication from St. Petersburg, expressing the desire of Russia to act in concert with France and England in the East. The Russian Cabinet reiterates its opinion that the events now transpiring in the East, hold in suspense the peace of the world, and that the very existence of Turkey is at stake.

The *Pays* seems to imply that more massacres are in contemplation, and that the excitors of the disturbances in Syria have ramifications in other parts of the Ottoman Territory; that the events in Syria were only a prelude to a for-

midable rising of the Ottoman population against the Christians, and the sinister projects are stated to have been long since concocted by fanatical conspirators.

The Paris correspondent of *The Herald*, says the 4,000 men collected at Totalan, have not embarked, and the dispatch of a larger force has been decided on.—*Tribune*.

### The French Emperor and Garibaldi.

Paris Correspondence of the London News.

I am assured that Garibaldi's Envoy to Paris was received by the Emperor to-day at St. Cloud as a private individual—the diplomatic phrase is "in an official character." Prince Giuseppe will probably by this time have arrived in London on a mission from the patriotic General, and Count Cavour has just sent the eminent ex-deputy, M. Valerio, to Sicily. Garibaldi, therefore, is at this moment playing a great part on the diplomatic stage.

### SELF PROTECTION OF PROPERTY-HOLDERS, FROM OFFICIAL ABUSES.

#### A PLAN PROPOSED.

To the property holders of New York and Brooklyn.

A majority of you will readily admit the necessity of some measure, to arrest the political corruption by which the property holders of these cities, are constantly subjected to intolerable abuses.

Allow one of your number to suggest a simple plan, which, he believes, if adopted, and put in operation, would fully protect us. It is this. Let the property holders, independent of political partizanship, organize themselves into an Association, in each ward where they hold property, to represent, according to their amount of property, by monthly meetings, the mutual interests of the whole body of those associated; to look after all dishonest official acts, affecting, injuriously, their just rights, and whenever they are violated, adopt legal and proper means for redress. By thus bringing offenders to a prompt and strict account, your influence and strength being thus combined, would hold them in check, as isolated and single efforts cannot now do, so that you daily become, one by one, the prey of official thieves. If associated, you would hold a balance of power which would command respect, wherever occasion calls for its exercise. Your deliberations could not be interfered with, as they now are, in your political meetings, by those whose sole object at such meetings is plunder, and who rob you with impunity, at their leisure.

Let every property-holder thus associated, be assessed by the association, in proportion to his amount of property held. This would give a fair and just representation to all the parties interested, and with a light expense on each, secure a fund sufficient to defray the necessary expenses of contesting unrighteous claims. In this way, these cities might soon be purged, and relieved from the political harpies that are now preying upon them. It would be an honorable achievement, deserving of public approbation and thanks to all who should participate in it. In this way we may reduce our taxes, and promote the substantial prosperity of the entire community. All our honest fellow citizens would be greatly benefitted by the reformation. All who rent property, or who consume the necessities of life, procured from those who do own or rent property, would soon feel the effects of a reduction of taxes, and of the breaking up of the system of plunder, by which, directly and indirectly, the entire community is laid under tribute to the plunderers.

S. A.

### VOLCANOE OF THE NORTHWEST.

The following interesting article is from the Des Moines (Iowa) *Commonwealth*:—"Mount Baker, and Mount St. Helens, in Washington Territory, are active volcanoes: the former smokes considerably, and occasionally shows a red light at night. St. Helens smokes a very little, the smoke in the day time resembling a thin column of white steam. There has been no eruption of St. Helens since 1842, at which time it covered the country with ashes to the Dalles, distant one hundred miles. Great streams of hardened lava are found in various places in Mount St. Helens and Mount Adams, and probably near the other sister volcano peaks. Mount St. Helens and Mount Baker are the only active volcanoes on the American soil, unless Mount Shasta, (which sometimes smokes a little, though not enough for the smoke to be seen from the foot of the mountain), be added to them. Mounts Hood, Rainier, Jefferson and Adams, were undoubtedly volcanoes once, but they are now extinct. In a paper contributed by George Gibbs, to the documents relating to the survey for a Northern Pacific railroad, he says the in-

dians have a characteristic tale relating to Mounts Hood and St. Helens, that they were formerly man and wife, but they quarreled, and threw fire at each other, and that St. Helens was the victor, since when Mount Hood has been afraid, while Mount Helens having a stout heart, still burns. There was still a further tradition among the Indians, when the writer was in Oregon, that Mount Hood and Mount St. Helens, were connected by a continuous ridge or chain, and that the Columbia river, which runs between them, had a subterranean passage at the point known as the 'Cascades.' The Columbia then had a smooth, even course, under an immense arch of the mountain, but the unfortunate matrimonial difficulty above referred to, did not end in throwing fire; they also broke down the conjugal arch, which fell with a thundering crash, into the river, and formed the 'Cascades.' The 'Cascades' are from one to two miles in length, and have a fall of about twenty feet per mile. Their appearance would indicate that there might be some truth in the tradition, and that it occurred at no very distant period,—perhaps within the last century. The opinion is sustained by the geological formation above the 'Cascades,' where the river spreads out and becomes a lake, some twenty miles in length, and several in breadth. The bottom of the lake in many places, is covered with a heavy growth of timber standing upright, in the exact condition it grew, no doubt, and reaching to the top of the water, say from 20 to 30 feet. The tops have long since disappeared, making the surface of the lake, at low water, look like a clearing full of stumps. On examination, the wood was found to be quite sound below the water. An answer to the question, how long has the forest been submerged? might also fix the period when these volcanoes became extinct."

## Family Miscellany.

### THE POOR POET.

For the Principia.

I've nursed thee, oh, Ambition,  
Within an humble breast,  
And to a lone, scant furnished room,  
How oft has thou been guest!

Yet not to bid the chafing blood  
Rush hotter in my veins,  
Nor make me loathe, in feverish thought,  
Earth's few and meagre gains;

But to shut out with blessed forms,  
The din, and dust, and care,  
To muffle the quick tread of want,  
That follows everywhere:

With cool, soft hand, to seal my eyes  
To sights confused and pained,  
With airy fingers on my brow,  
To guard its throne unstained.

Then to my ears, a harp-dost string  
Of sweetness most divine,—  
Oh, what all poverty and care  
With such a rapture mine!

Then linger yet, Ambition,  
Strength to my soul impart.—  
Thank God, thy heaven-sent mission  
Can stay the fainting heart!

And even should a changeful world  
Ring back so sad a name,  
Less sweet the day of victory, than  
The hour when first it came.

For the Principia.

### OLD LOVERS.

"John Anderson, my Jo, John,  
We've clamb the hill thegither;  
And mony a canty day, John,  
We've had wi' ane another:  
Now we maun totter down, John;  
But hand in hand we'll go,  
And sleep thegither at the foot,  
John Anderson, my Jo."

Young lovers are the unfailing theme of poet, philosopher, and romancer. Youthful love has been all worked up into verses and stories and essays, it has been turned every way, and viewed through all sorts of lenses, till it is fairly worn out—or would be, if Love were not immortal, and therefore as young and fresh in the hearts of Will and Mary to-day, as of Adam and Eve in Paradise. As it is, the subject is ever new. The ignorant, untaught girl behind the counter of the corner store, and the refined, cultivated lady reclining carelessly on the sofa of her Boudoir, equally loses consciousness to all around, over the last magazine love-story. Since the days of Homer, the world has not wearied of brave, noble heroes, and fair, lovely maidens. And all this is very beautiful, but O, why do we not hear more of old lovers? Are they so few? Does love, this same beautiful, earnest, devoted love, die out with youth? Does the hard and actual of life so over-sweep the ideal? Is love so weak, so easily overcome? Not always.

I saw a couple of Old lovers, once, just for a few moments. How much one may see in a moment! A look; a tone of voice; the meeting of two pair of eyes! I shall

never forget it. My heart has beat stronger ever since! I was traveling in western New York, when, one pleasant May morning found me at the Depot of the little village of C— awaiting the next train for the West. It was early when I entered the ladies' sitting room, and the sole occupants were an aged couple, of probably between seventy and eighty years. The old lady, apparently quite feeble, was leaning back in a large arm-chair, while her companion bent over her in anxious solicitude.

"What shall I do for you, Sally? Perhaps I can get you a cup of tea. Does your head ache?" he asked, gently laying his trembling hand on her wrinkled brow.

"No, John. Nothing now; unless—perhaps, you could get a tumbler of water."

The old man turned, and I met, as I knew I should, a noble brow, and a pair of earnest, sincere, loving blue eyes. His face lighted up as he saw me, and he said, with beautiful simplicity, "Sis, will you stay with her, while I go after some water?"

I yielded a glad assent, for my heart warmed toward the dear old people, as it never did to the happiest young couple Luna ever smiled upon. She was a simple hearted old woman; had never been fifty miles from home—so she told me—and had never seen a rail-road before, in her life. But now she was going to visit a married daughter, at a distance, and the journey was quite an undertaking for her. "John felt very anxious for her; he had traveled more, and was smarter than she was, and he was afraid it would be too much for her, with her nerves."

Her dress was simple; a plain, dark calico, neat and clean, and a checked apron, which she informed me she wore "to keep her gown clean." A large paste-board sun-bonnet completed her attire. I thought I could see, in imagination, the small brown house, the large barns, the chickens, the sheep, and cows, the plum trees, and rows of currant bushes, and the old well-sweep, which had been her world.

Soon "John" returned with the glass of water; and asked her again how she felt; and then he stooped to feel the brick at her feet, for "he was afraid she might catch cold and get the rheumatism; and so he warmed a brick to put to her feet when they started."

"It is most cold, Sally, but I shall have time to warm it, before the cars come. Sis will stay with you," he added kindly, glancing at me.

"He wouldn't leave me alone a minnit!" she said, her eyes following him fondly, as he went out. "I'm glad you're here, sis!" (By the way, I was just eighteen years of age, and considered myself a young lady, *par excellence*!)

And I sat and looked into the old lady's face, as she leaned back, wearily, in her chair. Time had whitened the locks, and furrowed the cheeks and brow, but there was an expression of childlike, simple happiness, which the world too often wears away, and which only a life, lighted by the sunshine of love can retain.

And when "John" had returned, and placed the warmed brick at her feet, he took a seat by her side, and held her hand, and—they met—those two pair of dimmed, old, blue eyes. How much they spoke! Young eyes meet, sometimes; joyous, sparkling eyes, full of the dew of life's bright morning, and look into each other with a bounding, happy, hopeful love; and young hearts greet, with glad some throb, the untried future. But those old eyes told of a tried love; a love that was strong—that had conquered; told of a love which the dust of the world had not dimmed, which the cares of life had not worn out, which storms had only served to root deeper in each heart.

I had a vision, as I sat there. I looked through those old faces, back, far back, a long labyrinth of years, and saw them young; saw a tall, manly form, full of the strength and elasticity of youth, saw the dark hair pushed carelessly back from a noble, rounded forehead, saw the quick, intelligent, earnest face. And I saw a slight, girlish figure, with rosy cheeks, and brown curls, and silvery laugh. I saw them part and meet, and exchange gay words, at "quilting" parties, and "spelling schools," and "donations." Then there came visions of Sunday evening calls, and then I saw them one evening, one bright, beautiful evening, sitting under the old apple tree, with the dear, old moon superintending them. The blue sun-bonnet was thrown back, the child-like face upturned, and the dancing, laughing eyes a

little sobered by the deep, earnest ones looking down into them. Thus two hearts met, and thus have met many thousand pairs of human hearts—but O, among them all, how few have clung to each other through the summer suns and winter storms of half a century; sharing the same joys, supporting each other in sorrow, bearing with every failing, and loving more deeply, more tenderly, to the last! How often have earthly cares and trifles wearied the spirit, and embittered and estranged the heart, till, ere life has reached its meridian, each soul works on, alone, by itself, coldly doing its duty for duty's sake, for the spirit of love is gone.

There is a period when the heart views its object, not as it is, but as it *may be*—for Love is a Prophet—and looks afar into the future. And, thus idealized, the loved one is beautiful, perfect, free from earthly taint. But when it comes down to real, actual, every day life, the dream is gone, the divinity is discovered to be mortal, with all a mortal's faults and failings. Then comes a chill of disappointment, and then, too often, misunderstanding and alienation. But to those who have faith to see through the present and imperfect, the ideal and beautiful, all failings, all trials will but prove links to unite them more closely, and love will conquer.

The shrill car-whistle arouses me. The old man wraps the shawl more closely around his companion, takes the huge willow basket on one arm, and with the other tenderly supports her trembling steps. Now they have mounted the platform, the car door closes, the train passes on, but *that* picture still remains with me.

Youthful love is beautiful—beautiful as the morning, with the sunshine on the dew-drops, and the larks singing, and the white, fleecy clouds with the blue sky between them; but the love of the aged is glorious, like the golden sunset, after a fitful April day of winds and showers, when the sunlight has conquered, and the clouds stand back in piles of snow, against the deepening azure.

### A Wonderful Cave.

MENSA. EDITORS:—According to promise, I herein give you another report concerning the cave at this place. Since my first winter visit, detailed in a previous letter (published on page 211, Vol. II., of the Scientific American), I have made frequent visits to the cave; but as there has been but little alteration, I have delayed a regular report until now. On June 23d, at about 10 A. M., a friend and I started on a midsummer trip, crossed the river in a boat and commenced the ascent of the bluff as usual; it being very steep and, upon the whole, like the river Jordan—"a hard road to travel." All difficulties, however, being surmounted, we arrived at the mouth of the cave, and sat down to rest awhile and cool ourselves; looking at the thermometer, we found it stood at 80°. Here we found several pieces of candle and one old candlestick left by other visitors. We then commenced the descent; and as we walked, crawled and slid along, it began to grow cold quite fast—it seemed like going out of a warm room into the cold atmosphere of a winter morning. We soon began to see the frost on the walls, sparkling in the light of our lamps like millions of diamonds. This one sight is worth as much as all the natural exhibitions of every-day life to every lover of the beautiful. As we came to our first stopping-place we began to find ice, from a mere film up to six or eight inches thick. This part of the cave is in the shape of a wedge with the small end up; it being about six feet wide at the base, the sides drawing together overhead about 20 feet high—the one side covered with ice (clear as crystal) and the other with sparkling frost. Now we hung the thermometer on the wall and waited the result; the mercury going down gradually to 30°, where it remained. We also had a little water in a cup, and after leaving it on the rock for about 10 minutes, it became skimmed over with ice. There is not near the usual amount of ice in the cave that there usually is at this season of the year; and no doubt it is owing to the dryness of the season. The present spring and summer, so far, has been very dry in Decorah; and I have noticed that the more rain we have, the more ice forms in and around the mouth of the cave. Two years ago, there was so much ice in the first 50 or 60 feet of the cave that we had to cut steps in it with a hatchet to get down with safety. A great quantity of rain fell during that season.

J. W. H.  
Decorah, Iowa, July 3, 1860.—Scientific American.

## "THOU HOLIEST LOVE WHOM MOST I LOVE."

Thou Holiest Love whom most I love,  
Who art my longed for, only bliss,  
Whom tenderest pity erst did move  
To fathom woe and death's abyss;  
Who once did suffer for my good,  
And die my guilty debts to pay,  
Thou Lamb of God, whose precious blood  
Can take a world's misdeeds away;

Thou Love, who didst such anguish bear  
Upon the mount of agony,  
And yet with ceaseless watchful care  
Dost yearn o'er us so tenderly;  
Thou camest not thy will to seek,  
But all thy Father's will t' obey,  
Bearing the cross in patience meek,  
That thou might'st take our curse away.

O Love, who with unflinching heart  
Enduredst all disgrace and shame;  
O Love, who mid the keenest smart  
Of dying pangs wert still the same;  
Who didst thy changeless virtue prove  
Even with thy latest parting breath,  
And spakest words of gentlest love  
When soul and body sank in death;

O Love, through sorrows manifold  
Hast thou betrothed me as a bride  
By ceaseless gifts, by love untold,  
Hast bound me ever to thy side.  
Oh let the weary ache, the smart,  
Of life's long tale of pain and loss,  
Be gently stilled within my heart  
At thought of thee and of thy cross!

O Love, who unto death hast grieved  
For this cold heart, unworthy thine,  
Whom once the chill dark grave received,  
I thank thee for that grief divine,  
I give thee thanks that thou didst die  
To win eternal life for me,  
To bring salvation from on high;  
Oh draw me up through love to thee!

Lyra Germanica.

ANGELUS, 1657.

## FASHIONABLE FRIENDS.

The hardest trial of those who fall from affluence and honor to poverty and obscurity, is the discovery that the attachment of so many in whom they confided was a pretence, a mask to gain their own ends, or was a miserable shallowness. Sometimes, doubtless, it is with regret that these frivolous followers of the world desert those upon whom they have fawned; but they soon forget them. Flies leave the kitchen when the dishes are empty. The parasites that cluster about the favorite of fortune, to gather his gifts and climb by his aid, linger with the sunshine, but scatter at the approach of a storm, as the leaves cling to the tree in summer weather, but drop off at the breath of winter, and leave it naked to the stinging blast. Like ravens settled down for a banquet, and suddenly scared by a noise, how quickly, at the first sound of calamity, these superficial earthlings are specks on the horizon!

But a true friend sits in the center, and is for all times. Our need only reveals him more fully, and binds him more closely to us. Prosperity and adversity are both revealers—the difference being that in the former our friends know us, in the latter we know them. But, notwithstanding the insincerity and greediness prevalent among men, there is a vast deal more of esteem and fellow-yearnings than is ever outwardly shown. There are more examples of unadulterated affection, more deeds of silent love and magnanimity than is usually supposed. Our misfortunes bring to our side real friends, before unknown. Benevolent impulses, where we should not expect them, in modest privacy, enact many a scene of beautiful wonder, amid plaudits of angels. And upon the whole, fairly estimating the glory and the uses, and the actual and possible prevalence of the friendly sentiment, we must cheerily strike the lyre and lift our voice to the favorite song, confessing, after every complaint is ended, that

"There is a power to make each hour  
As sweet as Heaven designed it;  
Nor need we roam to bring it home,  
Though few there be that find it!  
We seek too high, for things close by,  
And lose what nature found us:  
For life hath here no charm so dear  
As home, and friends around us."

North American Review.

Perfect virtue is to do, unwatched, what we should be capable of doing before the whole world.—*La Rochefoucauld.*

## ECONOMY AND SIMPLICITY.

The late Gov. Bouck, of New York, said to a friend after he had discharged the duties of the Chief Magistracy of the State about one year:

"When I first entered upon the office, I was so engaged in trying to reconcile conflicting opinions, produce harmony in the party, and please everybody, that I paid no attention to my household expenses. At the end of the first three months, my quarter's salary was paid, and my bills due were presented. To my utter dismay, the latter exceeded the former.—During my entire life, I had made it a point never to spend more in a quarter than I received for my earnings. I believed that to be a good rule, and that, as Governor of the State, I should not transgress it and set a bad example, which might be the means of ruining thousands. I began to cast about, to see where I could cut down my expenses. The State officers had hired the house I occupied, without consulting me, and the State paid the rent. I had nothing to say or do in that particular. The State officers, who, because I was a country farmer, took particular pains to instruct me, told me I must bring my best span of horses and carriage from my farm, in Schoharie, and ride in it, or I would degrade the high office to which the people had elected me. They also said that I must have a colored waiter to attend the door of my residence, and a head cook and three assistants in the kitchen, and two or three chambermaids, besides a coachman to drive my carriage. I remembered that during the entire quarter, I had not found time to ride in the carriage with my family, except to church on Sundays, then the coachman could not go to Church, having to take care of the team. This I did not believe was doing exactly right, or setting a good example. I thought that myself and family could walk to church, as the distance was not great. We thereby would appear not to feel above others who walked, and as the Governor's family, would be setting a better example than by riding. My wife also proposed to dismiss the chief cook and all the assistants but one, and she superintend the cooking—she always had done this on my farm; and my daughters proposed to dismiss the chambermaids, and they would do the chamber work. No sooner was this agreed upon, than accomplished. The large bays and carriage went back to the farm, in Schoharie, and the extra help was all dismissed. Everything worked like a charm. The colored doorman, whom I retained, assisted in waiting on the table. The State officers, and my city friends didn't observe but that all was as first arranged, when they called. We walked to church, and greeted kindly all we met there, and enjoyed the services without thinking of the coachman who could not attend them.—We reduced our expenses to within my salary. I felt better immediately, I feel better now.—I can discharge my duties better, and when my term of office expires, and I return to private life, I shall feel that when Governor of the State, I did not set an example of extravagance in any respect, which might be the means of ruining any one."

## DID I NOT DO IT WELL?

A rich man went to Washington, where he met with a member of Congress whom he had known when a lad in a very different condition of life.

"Why, sir," said he, "are you a member of Congress? I remember when you used to black my boots for me."

"Well, sir, did I not do it well?" was the prompt and appropriate reply.

Now, boys, let me tell you something. The great secret of success in this life is doing well, whatever one has to do.—And that thing is not in all respects well done which is not done at the right time.

"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might," and "never put off till to-morrow what ought to be done to-day."

Do what you have to do promptly, and you will not fail. True and lasting success is not the result of chance or luck, but of God's blessing on well directed effort. If you would prosper, you must strive for it.

Nor is there any honest occupation, however humble, that is not honorable if well followed. No one need be ashamed of humble birth, or hesitate to own the lowliest labor, if he can say the labor was well done.—*Biblical Re-*

## BENEFIT OF DROUGHT.

Every body says this is a most remarkable spring; the driest that ever the country knew, as old Parson Smith would say. The farmers are all grumbling in advance over the loss of the hay crop, and every body who has a garden is almost in despair.

Still we are taught that every thing has its uses, and a dry time is not to be considered an exception to the rule. As the drought is now with us in all its severity, it is a good time to set about the discovery and due appreciation of its compensations. If it turns out to be a blessing in disguise, we shall all the happier for a knowledge of the fact.

In the first place, then, we consider it an advantage to have a good long spell of pleasant weather. After the dreary experience of the last two springs, when rain, fog and east wind ruled the season, we are thankful for a little sunshine. We feel all the better for it and are happy to realize that this is the bright spring season of the year. Besides, we can all pursue our out-of-door avocations not only in better spirits, but to better advantage. Pleasant weather enables the farmer, who is supposed to be most liable to injury from the drought, to get in his seed and accomplish his spring work more easily than he could in rainy weather. Let everybody, therefore, make much of the sunshine, and not lose, in sighing for a blessing denied, the proper enjoyment of the blessing bestowed.

But the drought has even more direct advantages for the farmer than even the sunshine which accompanies it. It is nature's plan for re-invigorating the surface soil, a substitute for sub-soil plowing, so much neglected by some farmers. By repeated cropping the surface-soil becomes exhausted of its fertilizing materials, but away down in the earth there are great stores of these indispensable elements of vegetable products. How to reach them is the question. Man might if he would, but in most cases he is too lazy or too self-conceited to be at the pains. So the good Creator, in his beneficence sends a drought to draw up the phosphates, silicates, carbonates and salts, and thus restores the fertility of the cultivated soil. This is accomplished by sun-power, like all the great movements of nature's forces. The sun's rays evaporate the water in the surface of soil, and thus create a vacuum that is at once filled by water rising from the sub-soil—extended deeper and deeper as the drought continues and the moisture is exhaled—a circulation of water in the earth the reverse of that which takes place in wet weather. Now this water which comes from the depths of the earth, has acquired in its passage thither, by becoming imbued with carbonic acid from the decomposition of vegetable matter in the soil, a power of readily dissolving minerals which it did not possess when it first fell from the clouds. Consequently when it is drawn up during the drought, it brings with it in solution, salts of lime and magnesia, of potash and soda,—just the thing of which the top soil has become exhausted. Every drop of water is a tiny bucket let down into the great store-house of the earth and drawn up again by the sun's rays, filled with the fertilizing elements necessary to vegetation. The water on reaching the surface is evaporated, the salts remain to reinvigorate the soil. Thus while vegetation appears to be withering in the heat, the great forces of nature are beneficially employed in bringing to the surface, from the depths of the earth, where else they would be forever unemployed, the elements of future harvests.—*Portland Transcript.*

## OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS.

FOR THE MILLIONS.

- I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
- II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
- III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
- IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. By WILLIAM GOODELL.

A summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Legal opinions* collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution. AN APPENDIX contains extracts from State Constitutions and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest Territory; also, sentiments of the Revolutionary fathers &c.

PRICE, Single Copies, 12 cents; Per Dozen, One Dollar. Postage pre-paid, 3 cents per copy.

For sale by WILLIAM GOODELL, or M. B. WILLIAMS, Office of the Principia, 339 Pearl Street, New York. TERMS, CASH.

## WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the Principia:

DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols.,.....	\$1 50
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol.,.....	\$1 00
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol.,.....	\$0 75
TERMS CASH.	